DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 179 277 JC 800 029

AUTHOR Adamson, Willie D.
TITLE The Use of Students as Raters of Classroom Instruction to Compare Community College and University Instructors.
PUB DATE Apr 79
NOTE 30p.; Graduate seminar paper, Pepperdine University

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; College Students; *Community Colleges; Comparative Analysis; Postsecondary Education; *Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; Teacher Characteristics; *Teaching Quality; *Universities

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to compare composite student ratings of teacher performance at four California community colleges with composite student ratings at a public four-year institution. Students of five community college and six university accounting professors comprised the sample for the study. During the last class meeting of the fall term of 1978, a questionnaire asked students to rate their instructors in terms of their preparation for class, organization of presentations, knowledge of subject, overall teaching skills, level of self-confidence, sense of humor, fairness in dealing with students, and ability to relate to students. They were also requested to assess the value of assignments, currency of course material, how well exams covered the material, how well the grading system was explained, and how well the texts supplemented the lectures. Additionally, students were asked whether they would recommend the course and the instructor and how well the instructor compared with previous instructors. Responses were obtained from 614 university students and 162 community college students; 45 students also provided comments. The study revealed no significant difference between the mean ratings of community college and university instructors on any of the 15 profile items. The student report contains a review of the literature and a bibliography. (AYC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED179277

THE USE OF STUDENTS AS RATERS OF CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION TO COMPARE COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY INSTRUCTORS

by

WILLIE D. ADAMSON

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Willie D. Adamson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

An investigative paper

submitted in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for Education 706

PEPPERDINE UNIVERSITY

April, 1979

JC 800 029

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	The Problem	1
	The Purpose of the Study	2
	Importance of the Problem	3
	The Research Hypotheses	4
	Method of Study	6
	Definition of Terms	8
	Scope and Limitations of Study	8
II.	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	9
	Student Ratings of Classroom Instruction	9
	A Comparison of the Achievement of Native and Community College Transfer Students	10
III.	FINDINGS	12
	Test of Hypotheses	12
	Student Comments	12
IV.	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	15
	Summary	15
	Conclusions	16
	Recommendations	17
FOOTNOTES		19
BIBLIOGRAPHY		21
APPENDICES		
A.	Composite Student Rating Tables	23
B.	Unedited Student Comments	25

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter states the research problem and purpose of the investigative study, summarizes the importance of the problem, describes the method of study, sets out the research hypotheses, defines the terms used, and delineates the scope and limitations of the study.

The Problem

As both the number of students and financial support shrink, the mission of the community college to provide education for transfer appears to be threatened by declining enrollments at public four-year institutions. These institutions may be using the community college's lack of academic prestige and appeal to develop sophisticated marketing strategies and tactics to attract students that would otherwise attend the community college. For example, the marketing plan of one public four-year institution recommended that "Information . . . should be disseminated on the inherent advantages of attending a four-year institution, rather than being a transfer student . . ."[1] Similarly, the UCLA Daily Bruin stated that there was a "declining preparation of students entering the university from . . . community colleges."[2] As a result, many students who attend a community college and transfer to a public four-year institution may suffer through problems arising from transfer. The problems students may encounter can be numerous because of the novel

transfer practices and policies of the public four-year institutions to which they matriculate. Consequently, the transfer student may suffer from loss of credit, time, and money.

The mission of the community college is also threatened by public four-year institutions newfound interest in two-year and certificate occupational programs. UCLA's Extension, for example, listed 30 programs leading to certificates in its spring quarter 1979 schedule of classes. Some of these programs are:[3]

-- Business Management
-- Real Estate with Specialization
-- Accounting
-- Advertising
-- Building and Construction Management
-- Information Technology (four series)
-- Marketing and Sales Management
-- Personnel Management
-- Purchasing (three series)
-- Fashion Design
-- Journalism
-- Printmaking

The Purpose of The Study

Individuals and communities are becoming increasingly dependent on the performance of the community college. Therefore, any judgments about whether or not the community college is fulfilling its purposes and achieving its objectives should be made, in turn, by the people served.

This research, then, was conducted to compare composite student ratings of teaching performance at four community colleges with composite student ratings of a public four-year institution to determine whether agreement existed between the two groups as raters of the adequacy of classroom instruction. The comparison should shed some light on two critical problems facing the community college: (1) the assertion that there is a "declining preparation of students entering the university from community colleges;" and (2) the movement of some public four-year institutions toward the comprehensive educational philosophy of the community college.

Importance of the Problem

The administrative dimension and character of articulation agreements between community colleges and public four-year institutions appear to be headed for change. In an era of declining enrollments at four-year institutions, articulation seems to be influenced most by financial considerations, rather than adequate preparation for upper-division work. Commenting on the dynamics of the articulation problem with public four-year institutions, Leslie Koltai, Chancellor of the Los Angeles Community College District said, "They want to reopen their articulation agreements because they are not getting enough transfer students."[4] And Frank M. O'Kelley, Dean of Academic Affairs at Rio Hondo College added, "It is merely an attempt by public four-year institutions to obtain financial support from the state to finance their graduate programs."[5]

Carpenter aptly expressed the newfound interest of public four-year institutions in certificate vocational programs when he reported that:

> Threatened by declining enrollments . . . many four-year institutions are moving slowly toward the comprehensive educational philosophy of the community college and adding two-year and certificate vocational programs to their curricula. Two threats to (community colleges) may be perceived in this trend: (1) possible loss of enrollment through increased competition; and (2) the potential for upgrading occupational programs to the baccalaureate level, which would tend to reduce the vocational role of the (community) college to a transfer function, similar to the general education . . . function of the community college.[6]

The problem will become even more acute for the typical metropolitan community college in the future, as demographic data show a large decline in the number of 18-24 year-olds over the next fifteen years. By 1995, the numbers in this age group, which provide the majority of undergraduate students for public four-year institutions, will have declined by about 14 percent below present figures.[7]

The Research Hypotheses

The study was designed to test the following null hypotheses:

1. H_0: There is no significant difference between the means of community college and university instructors compared on the basis of preparatory classroom activities.
2. H_0: There is no significant difference between the means of community college and university instructors compared on the basis of presenting the material in an organized manner.
3. H_0: There is no significant difference between the means of community college and university instructors compared on the basis of their knowledge of subject.
4. H_0: There is no significant difference between the means of community college and university instructors compared on the basis of thier overall teaching skills.

5. H_0: There is no significant difference between the means of community college and university instructors compared on the basis of their levels of self-confidence.
6. H_0: There is no significant difference between the means of community college and university instructors compared on the basis of their sense of humor.
7. H_0: There is no significant difference between the means of community college and university instructors compared on the basis of their fairness in dealing with students.
8. H_0: There is no significant difference between the means of community college and university instructors compared on the basis of relating to students as individuals.
9. H_0: There is no significant difference between the means of community college and university instructors compared on the basis of the learning value of assignments.
10. H_0: There is no significant difference between the means of community college and university instructors compared on the basis of the currency of the course material.
11. H_0: There is no significant difference between the means of community college and university instructors compared on the basis of designing examinations which sample important material.
12. H_0: There is no significant difference between the means of community college and university instructors compared on the basis of explaining the grading system.
13. H_0: There is no significant difference between the means of community college and university instructors compared on the basis of their abilities to select textbooks which supplement the lecture material.

14. H_0: There is no significant difference between the means of community college and university instructors as to students recommending the course to others in their major, compared on the basis of material and course organization.

15. H_0: There is no significant difference between the means of community college and university instructors compared on the basis of comparison with other instructors at the respective institution.

Method of Study

To gather the data needed to test the hypotheses, a questionnaire was administered to students enrolled in each participating instructor's accounting course(s) at the end of the last regular class meeting of the fall term of 1978. Detailed instructions were provided with the questionnaire to assist students in understanding the nature of the information they were to provide. The questionnaire contained fifteen profile items. Each profile item was followed by five fixed response categories: Excellent, Good, Average, Below Average, and Poor, coded 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 respectively. To overcome the obvious limitations of the fixed response categories, the student was asked to make comments regarding the instructor's strongest and weakest points as well as explicit suggestions for course improvement. The fifteen profile items are as follows:

1. How well is he prepared when he enters the classroom?
2. How well is the presentation of the material organized?
3. His knowledge of his subject is:
4. What overall evaluation would you give his teaching skills?
5. The instructor's level of self-confidence is:
6. His sense of humor during the lecture is:

7. His fairness in dealing with students is:
8. How well does he relate to students?
9. How would you rate the learning value of assignments?
10. How current is the course material?
11. How well do the exams sample important material covered in class or assigned?
12. How well is the grading system explained?
13. How well does the textbook supplement the lecture material?
14. Would the material and organization lead you to recommend this course by this instructor to others in your major?
15. How does the instructor of this course compare with othe instructors you have had at this school?

To preserve student anonymity, the eleven participating instructors were required to turn the class over to a class monitor. The monitor administered the questionnaire and returned the ratings to the researcher. Secondly, a computer was used to summarize the responses for each course and to prepare the two composite summaries needed to test the hypotheses. Thirdly, the mean and standard deviation on each profile item were computed for each of the two groups of instructors. Fourthly, a student t-test was used to test the significance of difference between the two means for each profile item. A significance level of .05 (two-tailed) was selected to reject each hypothesis that there is a significance difference between the two means for each profile item.

Finally, student comments were analyzed and resolved into major categories.

Definition of Terms

Before proceeding with a discussion of the scope and limitations of the study, it is necessary to define some key terms.

Articulation:	Refers to practices, policies and agreements to produce a smooth flow of students from the community college to a four-year institution.
Community college:	"The community . . . college is a free public two-year educational institution that attempts to meet the post-high school educational needs of its local community."[9]
Public four-year institution:	A four-year college or university that is either a member of the University of California System or the California State University and Colleges System.

Scope and Limitations of Study

Five accounting instructors assigned to teach accounting courses during the fall term of 1978 at four community colleges: Chaffey, Fullerton, Long Beach and Mount San Antonio, and six accounting instructors at one university, California State Polytechnic, comprised the sample for study. All university instructors included in the study held Ph.D's.

The findings and conclusions drawn in this study are based solely on student ratings and comments. A well-planned evaluation system should include not only information from students but also, as a useful adjunct, information from the instructor himself, alumni and colleagues.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Student Ratings of Classroom Instruction

A mass of literature exists on student ratings, and many quality papers have been written on the subject. By far the best condensations of past research on student ratings of teaching performance are found in an article by Kent[9] and a more recent one by Costin, Greenbough, and Menges.[10]

Many interesting aspects of evaluating teaching performance have been substantiated by past research. The more significant research includes:[11]

1. Student ratings of teaching effectiveness are infrequently used by administrators when recommending faculty for salary adjustment, promotion, or tenure.

2. Well prepared rating scales of teaching effectiveness may be used to improve course content and invididual instructor's teaching effectiveness.

3. Student ratings of teaching effectiveness are valid, reliable measures.

4. Student ratings correlate highly with administrator's ratings of teaching effectiveness.

5. Most studies indicate that the relationship between the grade expected in a course and a student's evaluation of the instructor's teaching effectiveness show little positive correlation.

6. Student ratings of teaching effectiveness are not significantly influenced by an elective or required course, course difficulty, major or non-major course, grade point average, class size, and student's or teacher's sex.

7. Two factors, student's class rank and faculty's academic rank, bear strong relationship to student ratings of teaching effectiveness.

8. Student ratings are less critical than most faculty and students would expect.

9. The increase in the credibility and use of students as raters affecting administrative decisions has been sufficient enough to raise the specter of "the student as Godfather."

10. Generalizing from student ratings over profile items, courses and students, with the instructor as the object of measurement, yields highly dependable results.

While a mass of literature exists related to student ratings of classroom instruction, none employed a common instrument to compare composite student ratings of community college and university instructors. This research, then, makes a methodological extension of existing research by comparing the two faculties in an attempt to shed some light on the critical issues of whether the community college is fulfilling its purposes and achieving its objectives as a community-based comprehensive institution.

A Comparison of the Achievement of Native and Community College Transfer Students

Groft has compared the achievement of native and community college transfer students by using the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants raw and percentile scores and the final course grades in Intermediate Accounting I as criterion measurements. The principal findings were as follows:

1. The achievement of native and transfer students was not significantly different when using the AICPA raw and percentile scores and the final grades in Intermediate Accounting I as criterion measurements.

2. When comparing the elementary and intermediate accounting achievement of students majoring in accounting, no significant difference was found between native or transfer students.

3. Neither native and transfer sophomores nor juniors demonstrated any significant differences in their level of achievement in Intermediate Accounting I.

4. Female transfer students, junior native students and native students in the 22-25 age group earned the highest grades in Intermediate Accounting I.

Based on these findings, Groft concluded that community college transfer students could perform as well academically as native students in four-year institutions.[12]

CHAPTER III

FINDINGS

Test of Hypotheses

In terms of the hypotheses tested, the results are presented in Table 1. The items presented in Table 1 are serially numbered and correspond to the same numbering system used to state the null hypotheses and profile items. Each null hypothesis stated that there was no significant difference between the mean of community college instructors and the mean of university instructors for each profile item. Table 1 indicates that the null hypothesis was accepted in each case. For example, the mean score of community college instructors for item number 1 was 4.78 (standard deviation of 8.67) while the mean score of university instructors was 4.31 (standard deviation of 6.03). The computed t-value for item number 1 was .11, which is not significant at the .05 level (two-tailed).

Student Comments

Forty-five community college students utilized the questionnaire to make comments about their instructors. These comments were overwhelmingly favorable and are summarized in rank order as follows:

1. The most repeated comment that community college students had was their instructors' command of the subject and teaching skills. Thirty-three students felt the need to comment on these items.

Table 1

Means, Standard Deviations, & Significance of Difference Between Means of Community College Instructors & University Instructors

Item No.	Group N=5 Community College Instructors M	SD	Group N=6 University Instructors (Ph.D's) M	SD	Computed t-Value	Hypothesis Rejected or Accepted
1	4.78	8.67	4.31	6.03	.11	Accepted
2	4.57	6.74	3.97	4.46	.18	Accepted
3	4.50	9.98	4.57	7.95	.01	Accepted
4	4.54	6.48	3.94	4.35	.18	Accepted
5	4.80	8.82	4.39	6.47	.09	Accepted
6	4.30	5.13	4.09	4.80	.07	Accepted
7	4.46	6.12	4.00	4.59	.14	Accepted
8	4.20	4.94	3.77	3.59	.17	Accepted
9	4.40	5.66	4.00	4.38	.13	Accepted
10	4.45	5.98	4.16	5.29	.09	Accepted
11	4.30	5.30	3.92	4.27	.13	Accepted
12	4.37	5.65	3.84	4.11	.18	Accepted
13	4.29	5.08	3.93	4.25	.13	Accepted
14	4.59	7.47	3.92	4.68	.18	Accepted
15	4.56	7.04	3.92	4.47	.18	Accepted

two-tailed test

2. Community college instructors maintain an informal and congenial relationship with students beyond the classroom; are consistently available to students for consultation about personal and academic problems.

3. Community college instructors make learning exciting and enjoyable, and motivate students to become involved in their courses.

4. Community college instructors concentrate on the learning setting, no matter what individual differences in ability may exist among students.

5. Several students, within the same class, indicated that the instructional pace was either too fast or too slow and vice versa.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The study was conducted to compare composite student ratings of teaching performance at four community colleges with composite student ratings at a public four-year institution. The purposes of the comparison were to test the validity of the assertion that there is a "declining preparation of students entering the university from community colleges" and the movement of some public four-year institutions toward the comprehensive educational philosophy of the community college.

Fifteen null hypotheses were tested: there were no significant differences between the means of community college and university instructors compared on the basis of composite student ratings. In no case was the significance level even near the rejection level of .05 (two-tailed).

Students' written comments elaborated on their satisfactions with community college instructors. The students felt that their instructors provided effective teaching and learning environments in which instructors and students interact to identify personal and academic problems to which they should address their objective temperaments and sensitivities.

Conclusions

The findings of this research suggest the following conclusions:

1. Since no significant differences were found in the teaching performance of community college and university instructors, it was concluded that the two groups of instructors are similar in quality.

2. Since no significant differences were found in the teaching performance of community college and university instructors, it was concluded that prospective community college transfer students will perform as well academically as native students in the four-year institutions. Therefore, the assertion that there is a "declining preparation of students entering the university from community colleges" is merely a strategy employed by public four-year institutions to augment their enrollments.

3. Community colleges are able to attract highly competent, experienced career instructors who share fully in the sense of mission assigned to community colleges; they give of themselves freely, have a high level of frustration and emphasize learning with understanding.

4. The typical community college is a conglomerate mass of heterogeneous students. (This conclusion is based on the finding that several students indicated that the instructional pace was either too fast or too slow and vice versa.)

5. Community college instructors know a great deal about injecting information into students and guiding them in the acquisition of occupational skills and expertise. They find means, techniques, and materials to enable the largest proportion of their students to master the subject before them: the adaptive mode of teaching.

6. Since no significant differences were found in the teaching performance of community college and university instructors, it was concluded that community colleges have excellent two-year and certificate occupational programs.

In summary, it was concluded that the community college is fulfilling its purposes and achieving its objectives as a community-based comprehensive institution.

Recommendations

In view of the milieu of budget cuts, that many public four-year institutions are slowly moving toward the comprehensive educational philosophy of the community college, and that public four-year institutions are using the community college's lack of academic prestige and appeal to attract students and are making unfavorable and unfounded assertions regarding transfer students, the community college must develop strategies to take advantage of its special strength: teaching effectiveness. It can apply itself to the task of developing strategies around its strength or it can stand by and watch public four-year institutions assume more and more of its mission. To achieve this objective, the community college must provide not only effective teaching and programs desired, but also the students. Therefore, it is recommended that:

1. To attract more students, a direct mail campaign directed at local high school students should be designed. It should include information regarding programs offered and faculty. A follow-up activity, such as a personal invitation to the student and parents to attend an open house, would be appropriate. At this time, personnel could be available to answer any questions prospective students might have.

2. More information should be made available on the differential costs of education i.e., community college versus public and private four-year institutions. Information regarding costs and comparisons should be disseminated along with all other promotional materials used.

3. More attention must be paid to the long-range plans of prospective transfer students and emerging transfer practices and policies of receiving four-year institutions. Better communication between community colleges and four-year institutions, developing transfer courses in consultation with four-year institutions, and providing students with transfer guidelines will help to ensure the transferability of courses.

4. Better articulation is needed between community colleges and four-year institutions. Articulation is clearly needed and must be improved because of the different situations which may occur before and after a student transfers.

The challenge is one of keeping abreast of changing needs, desires and perceptions of potential students, and retention of the comprehensive educational philosophy of the community college with a view toward expanding, modifying or eliminating programs which do not serve the needs of the community. Planning must be continuous; no plan is static. If recommendations do not generate results, they must be revised or discarded and new plans developed and implemented.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Patricia M. Hopkins, "A Marketing Analysis of Potential Students," (Office of Institutional Research, California State Polytechnic University, September, 1978), p. 76.

[2]Tamar Manjikian, "What's in UCLA's Future? Administrators Brace for Next 10 Years," UCLA Daily Bruin, March 5, 1979, p. 6.

[3]UCLA Extension, Spring Quarter Schedule of Classes, March, 1979.

[4]Leslie Koltai, "Some Political Consequences and Educational Observations on Proposition 13 and the Community College," Unpublished statements presented to the Members of Pepperdine University Community College Advisory Council, Los Angeles, California, March 2, 1979.

[5]Frank M. O'Kelley, in a personal interview, Whittier, California, January 12, 1979.

[6]Don A. Carpenter, "Bridging the Gap Between Vocational Education and the Liberal Arts," Community College Review, 6, No. 3 (Winter, 1979), p. 21.

[7]David S. Saxon, Report to the University of California Board of Regents on University-Wide Planning Initiatives, San Francisco, California, January 19, 1979.

[8]James W. Thornton, Jr., The Community Junior College, 3d. ed., (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1972), p. 288.

[9]Laura Kent, "Student Evaluation of Teaching," The Educational Record, XLVII (Summer, 1966), pp. 376-406.

[10]Frank Costin, William T. Greenbough, and Robert J. Menges, "Student Ratings of College Teaching: Reliability, Validity, and Usefulness," Review of Educational Research, XXXXI, No. 5 (December, 1971), pp. 511-535.

[11]See Kent; Costin, Greenbough, and Menges; James W. Pattillo, "The Student Evaluates the Instructor," Accounting Instruction: Concepts and Practices (2nd ed.; South-Western Publishing Co., 1968), pp. 10-132; John A. Centra, The Student as Godfather, ed. James D. Edwards (The American Accounting Association), pp. 475-481; and Gerald M. Gillmore, Michael T. Kane, Richard W. Naccarato, "The Generalizability of Student Ratings of Instruction: Estimation of the Teacher and Course Components," Journal of Educational Measurement, 15, No. 1 (Spring, 1978), pp. 1-13.

[12]William L. Groft, "Achievement of Native and Transfer Accounting Students in Selected Colleges and Universities in Pennsylvania," Collegiate News and Views, XXXII, No. 2 (Winter, 1978-79), pp. 5-7.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Carpenter, Don A. "Bridging the Gap Between Vocational Education and the Liberal Arts," Community College Review, 6 (Winter, 1979): pp. 13-23.

Centra, John A. The Student as Godfather, edited by James D. Edwards. United States of America: American Accounting Association, 1974.

Costin, Frank; Greenbough, William T.; and Menges, Robert J. "Student Ratings of College Teaching: Reliability, Validity, and Usefulness." Review of Educational Research XXXXI (December 1971): pp. 511-535.

Gillmore, Gerald M.; Kane, Michael T.; and Naccarato, Richard W. "The Generalizability of Student Ratings of Instruction: Estimation of the Teacher and Course Components." Journal of Educational Measurement 15, (Spring 1978): pp. 1-13

Groft, William L. "Achievement of Native and Transfer Accounting Students in Selected Colleges and Universities in Pennsylvania." Collegiate News and Views XXXII (Winter 1978-79): pp. 5-7.

Hopkins, Patricia M. "A Marketing Analysis of Potential Students," California State Polytechnic University, September 1978. (Mimeographed)

Kent, Laura. "Student Evaluation of Teaching." The Educational Record XLVII (Summer 1966): pp. 376-406.

Koltai, Leslie. "Some Political Consequences and Educational Observations on Proposition 13 and the Community College." Pepperdine University Community College Advisory Council Meeting, Los Angeles, California, March 2, 1979.

Manjikian, Tamar. "What's in UCLA's Future? Administrators Brace for Next 10 Years." UCLA Daily Bruin, March 5, 1979, p. 6.

O'Kelley, Frank M. Rio Hondo College, Whittier, California. Interview, January 12, 1979.

Pattillo, James W. Accounting Instruction: Concepts and Practices, 2nd ed. (Cincinnati: South-Western Publishing Co., 1968).

Saxon, David S. "Report to the Board of Regents on University-Wide Planning Initiatives." San Francisco, California, University of California, January 19, 1979.

Thornton, James W., Jr. The Community Junior College, 3d ed. (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1972).

Table 2

Composite Student Ratings of Teaching Performance
University Instructors (N=6)

Profile Items (abridged)	Rating Scale Responses: Excellent	Good	Average	Below Average	Poor	Total
1. Is well prepared	324	194	70	16	10	614
2. Subject matter presentation	204	256	97	39	16	612
3. Knowledge of subject matter	421	133	35	10	8	607
4. Overall evaluation of teaching skills	209	237	98	42	22	608
5. Level of self-confidence	344	179	67	9	6	605
6. Sense of humor during the lecture	241	229	109	15	16	610
7. Fairness in dealing with students	249	178	125	33	19	604
8. Relates to students as individuals	176	204	152	51	20	603
9. Learning value of assignments	215	226	118	32	13	604
10. Presents current developments	267	223	73	19	20	602
11. Exams relate to course material	211	209	105	41	23	589
12. Explanation of grading system	219	191	115	42	38	605
13. Textbook supplements the lecture material	210	219	108	42	22	601
14. Would recommend course to others	245	184	78	37	47	591
15. Comparison with other instructors at this school	232	203	88	42	36	601

Table 3

Composite Student Ratings of Teaching Performance
Community College Instructors (N=5)

Profile Items (abridged)	Rating Scale Responses: Excellent	Good	Average	Below Average	Poor	Total
1. Is well prepared	130	29	3	0	0	162
2. Subject matter presentation	101	53	7	1	0	162
3. Knowledge of subject matter	147	14	1	0	0	162
4. Overall evaluation of teaching skills	96	58	7	1	0	162
5. Level of self-confidence	132	27	3	0	0	162
6. Sense of humor during the lecture	72	68	20	2	0	162
7. Fairness in dealing with students	91	58	10	2	1	162
8. Relates to students as individuals	56	84	20	2	0	162
9. Learning value of assignments	85	57	19	1	0	162
10. Presents current developments	88	61	11	2	0	162
11. Exams relate to course material	79	59	19	4	1	162
12. Explanation of grading system	87	50	23	2	0	162
13. Textbook supplments the lecture material	74	63	22	3	0	162
14. Would recommend course to others	114	35	9	3	1	162
15. Comparison with other instructors at this school	108	39	12	3	0	162

APPENDIX B

Unedited Student Comments

Fullerton

"Instructor relates to students well. She has a good sense of humor and makes the class enjoyable."

"She is very knowledgeable of her subject: good at explaining, very fair and humorous. An excellent instructor!!!"

"She explains the subject very well and her knowledge is current."

"Instructor speaks too fast when lecturing. However, she knows her subject very well."

"The instructor will help you with any problem you may have--personal or class related."

"Excellent instructor! It is obvious that she cares about the students."

"She is strict, tough and demanding. She is always well prepared and expects the same from her students. The only problem that I had was that she kept you working so hard that there was no time to relax."

"She is a very fine teacher and person. Don't fire her!"

"She is a very good teacher. I learned a great deal from her. I plan to take another course from her next semester and I have recommended her to my friends."

"She is a very smart and on top of things teacher. She knows her subject by heart, which impresses me very much. I really don't think she has any weaknesses."

"She is an excellent teacher. I plan to take another course from her. She knows her stuff and is good at getting the message across. She is open to any questions a student might have and will gladly spend time working with students."

"I feel that if the class was slowed down a little, it would be to the student's advantage."

"In regards to item #15, this is the first teacher I have had at the college--I just hope my others are as good."

"She goes a little too fast. If the class was a little slower, it would be better."

Mount San Antonio

"He is outstanding and a very dedicated instructor. I have really enjoyed his class."

"I feel that he is a very fine instructor. He does a very fine job in getting concepts and ideas across to the students. I also felt very comfortable in his class."

Chaffey

"I feel that he is one of the finest teachers that I have had."

"Very patient--good with students."

"He made a course that could have been stale, interesting and enjoyable."

"He is a very caring teacher and has a real concern for his students beyond what most teachers have. The students can really relate to him."

"Very tolerant."

"I enjoyed the class very much and must commend him for his patience."

"His explanations of the textbook and homework were excellent. Otherwise, I would never have gained a good understanding of what we were to learn from reading the textbook. His teaching methods were excellent. After class, I understood the material 100% better than when I went in."

Long Beach

"He covers the material very clearly and also has a good speaking voice."

"He is a well prepared teacher. He was very efficient and helpful, and works very hard with the students."

"Compared with other teachers in this school, this teacher is very patient and willing to explain anything--a very good teacher."

"I think he is the best instructor in the Long Beach Community College District. He has helped me greatly. I wish there were more instructors at all levels of education like him."

"He has great concern for his students' understanding of the material presented. He has infinite patience in explaining difficult concepts. I feel I could gain employment through this first course in accounting."

"I am very pleased to have had him as my teacher. I feel that I have learned the subject very well."

"Too slow. Too repetitious. Entire class brought to the level of the slowest students."

"He is always on time, very much like an accountant should be. Most people would like to be like him--well respected. One of the better teachers I have had."

"The only change I think is needed is that this instructor could have moved a little faster. He was almost too thorough."

"He is an excellent teacher. In fact, the best in my history of school. He explains the subject well and is willing to help with any problem. He has a good system of teaching."

"I enjoyed him as my teacher. I wish that he were teaching in higher levels of courses that I am taking! I would recommend him highly to other students!"

"He knows his material well and does not, as do many teachers I have had in the past, feel put upon by answering questions and taking time to make sure the students understand what he is teaching."

"His teaching was a little too much on the fast side for me to grasp everything. Otherwise, he is a fine teacher and a good person.

"I was advised to take this class from him by some friends. They were right: he is one of the best teachers at Long Beach."

"In my opinion, this instructor is of the highest caliber. He is not only a very effective instructor, but also very personable. He makes every attempt to accommodate his students in their learning experiences. I would certainly recommend him to others."

"He has a way of explaining accounting that makes it very easy to understand."

"A superior, dedicated, and professional teacher."

"A very thorough and patient man. He is an excellent instructor and not one single improvement comes to my mind."

"Could slow down."

"He is by far the most dedicated and best prepared teacher that I have had at this school. He is an invaluable asset to the teaching profession and I really wish I could enjoy his teaching methods in subsequent courses. He is a credit to the profession. Don't lose him."

"Extremely patient and thorough."

"He does an excellent job of relating the subject on an understandable level."

JAN 18 1980

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES
96 POWELL LIBRARY BUILDING
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
EE 36